

**ARIZONA JUDICIAL COUNCIL'S
LIMITED JURISDICTION COURTS COMMITTEE**

**Arizona State Courts Building
Conference Room 345A & B
Phoenix, AZ 85007**

September 25, 2002

Members Attending:

Honorable R. Michael Traynor, Chair
Honorable George Anagnost
Ms. Kathy Barrett
Ms. Faye Coakley
Honorable Judy Ferguson
Honorable Sherry Geisler
Honorable Linda Hale
Ms. Joan Harphant

Honorable John Kennedy
Mr. Theodore Jarvi
Ms. Pam Jones
Honorable John Lamb
Honorable Michael Lester
Mr. Frank Maiocco, Jr.
Honorable Antonio Riojas, Jr.
Mr. Paul Thomas

Absent Members:

Honorable Ronald O. McDaniel
Honorable G.M. Osterfeld (excused)

Mr. Dale Poage (excused)
Honorable Mary Scott

Guests:

Mr. Chris McBride
Mr. Gordon Mulleneaux
Ms. Pamela Najera

Honorable Sheri Newman
Mr. Scott Owens

Staff:

Mr. Tom Adams
Mr. Todd Adkins
Ms. Theresa Barrett
Ms. Ellen Crowley
Mr. George Diaz, Jr.
Mr. Greg Eades
Ms. Debby Finkel
Ms. Jennifer Greene
Ms. Patience Huntwork

Ms. Lori Johnson
Ms. Pam Pucetas
Mr. David Sands
Mr. Bob Schaller
Ms. Janet Scheiderer
Ms. Laura Snyder
Ms. Nancy Swetnam
Ms. Paula Taylor
Mr. David Withey

REGULAR BUSINESS

1. Call to Order

Judge R. Michael Traynor called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

Judge Traynor introduced the three new LJC members, Judge Linda Hale (Bowie JP Court), Ms. Joan Harphant (Tucson Municipal Court) and Mr. Frank Maiocco (Flagstaff JP Court). He then introduced Mr. Tom Adams, new Manager III for Court Services, Court Operations Unit and Ms. Lori Johnson, the new Policy and Procedural Manual specialist and staff to LJC. He further announced that Ms. Julie Dybas is the new Manager II for Court Services, Court Operations Unit.

Judge Traynor announced that this is Ms. Debby Finkel's last meeting as LJC staff and presented her with a certificate of appreciation.

Judge Traynor asked everyone to introduce themselves, by name and court.

2. Approval of Minutes from the May 22, 2002 Meeting and August 16, 2002 Telephonic Meeting

Judge Traynor asked if there were any changes or corrections to the May and August meeting minutes. Ms. Finkel stated that some typographical errors and one misspelled name have been corrected on the system. No additional corrections were made.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded **to approve the minutes from the May 22 and August 16, 2002 meetings as corrected. Motion was passed unanimously. LJC-02-11**

INFORMATION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

3. Pending and Proposed Rules Updates

Ms. Patience Huntwork, Chief Staff Attorney for the Supreme Court, acknowledged that current methods of giving public notice for pending Rule changes do not seem to be effective. The Supreme Court holds Rules Agendas three times per year, September, January and May. The Court is not bound to make their agendas public.

Ms. Huntwork updated the members on the following pending Rules actions:

1. Status report on the Rule for rapid transcripts to prepare appeals. It is a superior court project.

2. Discuss if jurors in criminal cases can begin to discuss evidence at their first meeting. Right now, they cannot discuss evidence until the end of the trial.
3. Take final action concerning the change of judge rule changes. There was an experiment to see if some new procedures helped stem some of the abuse in change of judge actions.
4. Hear a local rule change for probate and mental health cases in Pima County.
5. Hear Rule 15.9 which is mostly superior court
6. Take final action on the Superior Criminal Rules of Appeal and Civil Traffic Rules of Appeal.
7. Grant new and extended comment period for Rule 17.2. It was removed from the October 1st Rules agenda and may be on the January one. This Rule was to advise defendants of immigration status with guilty pleas.
8. Hear a provision to open the judicial code of conduct to allow judges to present speeches at fund raiser for indigent defense or scholarships for legal studies.
9. Hear an amendment to Rule 29 for retention and destruction of records in limited jurisdiction courts.
10. Hear changes based on the Ring decision
11. Hear proposal to make changes in relation to the felony centers, Maricopa County local Rule 2.3 and 2.4. Emergency enactment has been requested. R02-0034
12. Hear Rule petition which the Attorney General would require notification of victims. R02-0035
13. Hear about the rights of judges to make statements.
14. Hear about a local Rule in Yavapai County regarding alternative dispute resolution.
15. Hear about new Rule 1.7, initial appearance master. There was a request for an emergency enactment.
16. Hear about automatic change of judge.

Ms. Huntwork stated there are Motions for Reconsideration for Rule 15. A newer version passed while this workgroup was amending Rule 15. As a result some provisions dropped off Rule 15 because the committee was working off the original version. The provisions that dropped off are still in effect.

4. Legislative Update

Mr. George Diaz, Jr., Mr. David Sands and Mr. Todd Adkins presented the proposals received by the AOC for the members' review.

03-02 Protection of Judges' Personal Information

Adds Justices of the Supreme Court, Judges of the Court of Appeals, judges and commissioners of the superior court and municipal courts. They need to request redaction of records through an affidavit. This proposal applies to counties with a population of 500,000 or more.

Question was raised regarding the exclusion of justices of the peace. Mr Diaz responded that this proposal did not include any elected officials.

The redaction would be in effect for the judge's term of office plus three years. Some LJC members expressed concern about abuses of this request to redact. Judge George Anagnost believes that the redaction should be based on privacy and not based on the belief of being in danger as is in the proposal. The personal information is already out for the public to see.

Judge Michael Lester suggests that Option A means to approve the proposal without the affidavit provision. Another action is not include in package and have a different group present this proposal.

Judge John Kennedy asked Mr. Diaz that if this applied to all sitting judges would there be a better chance for success. Mr. Diaz believed that it would.

Vote: 4 Not approve
11 Option A

03-07 Juror Compensation Task Force

Establishes a task force to review and recommend changes to the juror compensation statutes, rules, procedures and other related issues.

Judge Lester mentioned that the impact statement does not include municipal courts.

Ms. Joan Harphant suggested that Option A includes municipal courts.

Vote: 1 Not approve
15 Option A

03-12 Domestic Violence Definition

Expands the definition of domestic violence to include dating couples and certain children within the class of persons who may obtain an order of protection against domestic violence. Defines victim as a child of a parent who is related to defendant.

ARS §13-3601 adds new #6 and 7

Judge Traynor and Mr. Ted Jarvi expressed concern that # 6 and # 7 do not define dating relationship. Judge Anagnost said this follows the federal guidelines. He expressed concern that the forms need the definition to assist the counter clerks and to help simplify the process.

Judge Tony Riojas expressed a preference for a different group to take this proposal forward. Judge Kennedy CIDVC should find other groups to run the bill.

Judge John Lamb suggested that Option A, to support, but not include in the package. Judge Lester recommends that dating relationships should be in orders of protection statutes and out of the injunctions against harassment statutes.

Vote: 3 Not approve
13 Option A

03-14 Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP)

Allows employees to retire, but to continue to work. The amount from a monthly pension would go into an account and be held there collecting interest for one, two or three years. At the end of the period, the monies would either be paid in a lump sum or go into an IRA account for the retired employee.

Arizona State Retirement System (ASRS) has a DROP plan which, per Mr. Diaz, is more of a loan than a DROP system as proposed. The proposed system would be in addition to what is currently in effect. The Department of Corrections fund administrator and Elected Officials Retirement Program fund administrator are supportive of this proposal.

Vote: 12 Approve
3 Not approve

Mr. Sands reminded the LJC members of the weekly legislative teleconference calls on Fridays at noon once the legislative session begins. They will inform LJC members of the telephone number once it has been identified.

LJC prioritized their two proposals

#1	03-07	8 votes
#2	03-14	5 votes

Working Lunch

5. Executive Committee Update

Judge Traynor discussed the main topics reviewed by the Executive Committee

over the summer.

1. The committee discussed Rules petitions and how best to get the information back to LJC. The Executive Committee does NOT act on behalf of the full committee.
2. Judge Elizabeth Finn brought the issue of the release questionnaire. She requested that a check box specific to domestic violence be added to the form. The Executive Committee recommended that the entire release questionnaire be reviewed and reformatted for ease of use. She agreed to the review. She intends to form a committee.
3. Domestic Violence forms were discussed. The Executive Committee recommended that only the legislative changes be completed by the August 22nd implementation date. They believe that all the forms will be redrafted by the CIDVC forms committee.
4. Court interpreters issues were heard and are on the agenda for discussion.
5. Centralized Citation Processing Bureau is a projected managed by Ms. Kate Bibber and Ms. Pam Pucetas. It has three components; citation data entry, collections efforts and the lock box.

The Executive Committee asked if there have been other studies done in other states. If so, what were the other states' processes and were they effective? No studies had been conducted, so there is no way of knowing if centralized processing was effective.

The Executive Committee expressed concern about how the process would work with photo radar for red light. The red light component of centralized processing would be eliminated from the bureau. The committee also asked if courts would be able to pick and choose participation in parts of the project.

They also asked if this project is good public policy? Will it improve customer service? How will paper and information flow work? They also questioned if this should be limited to collections. They also asked how soon cities would have information to present to their funding authorities for the budget cycles. Several of the centralized processing bureau specifications require funding for changes to automated systems and other processes.

The centralized bureau would have limitations as to the kind of monies can be brought in, for example, show proofs should not be sent to the bureau. If a defendant wants to see a judge, that would not go to the bureau. The lock box approach appears to be problematic with the two-way flow of information. There are similar issues with collections efforts and Debt Setoff.

6. ACJA for Standardized Allocation of Payments in Criminal or Juvenile Cases - Superior Court

Ms. Debby Finkel and Mr. Gordon Mulleneaux presented the ACJA that was designed for superior courts, to standardize the allocation of each payment. Changes made to the ACJA section were based on Committee on Probation and Superior Court Administrators Association. The most substantive was making fines and surcharges a higher priority than attorney fees. COP was concerned that victims who received funds through a portion of the surcharge.

Ms. Kathy Barrett expressed concern that limited jurisdiction courts would end up using the same allocation without having any input. Ms. Finkel explained that given the differences in court levels and issues that limited jurisdiction courts would have their own ACJA standardizing allocation. Superior court payments are vertically paid, each payment being broken down into several categories. Limited jurisdiction court payments are horizontally paid, each payment going to one category until that one is paid in full before paying the next category.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded that **AJC defer action on the ACJA section to allow for limited jurisdiction and general jurisdiction priorities for allocations to be developed. Motion passed. LJC 02-12**

7. Defensive Driving Subcommittee

Defensive Driving Program Rules - Proposed Changes to Third Party Contracts

Mr. Bob Schaller stated that current rules prohibit third party contracts with non-certified entities in limited circumstances. The Defensive Driving Program would monitor the third party contracts and hold the schools responsible for any non-compliance matters.

The rule changes are out for public comment. One comment has been received to date.

Judge Lester expressed concern about using third party contractors for testing. He suggested that testing be in a different paragraph with tightened verbiage that clarifies the restrictions. Ms. Nancy Swetnam agreed that tightening the verbiage about testing could enhance the rule. She explained that each school's plan is reviewed for meeting the standards that are established.

Ms. Pamela Najera, AZ Chapter of the National Safety Council, views this change as a lessening of standards. Testing needs to be done under certified instructors or the school itself. She does not want to be responsible for third party contractors who violate the rule. All schools should be held to the same standards.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve non-certified third party contracts for all contracted services but testing. Motion was passed unanimously. LJC 02-13**

8. ACJA for Emergency Authority

Mr. Greg Eades stated the ACJA for Emergency Authority was removed from the October AJC meeting to allow for more time to study the issue. The only comments he has received regarding this concern giving the judges' more authority to act first and then report.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve the ACJA for Emergency Authority as presented. Motion was passed unanimously. LJC 02-14**

9. Committee to Study Jury Practices and Procedures

Honorable Sheri Newman, Clerk of Superior Court in La Paz County, presented the differences from the preliminary report.

1. Refined the jury compensation portion and requested a task force be appointed.
2. One day/one trial is included in the Jury Management Code with a July 1, 2005 implementation date. Exemptions to this requirement could be granted annually as needed.
3. Jury management curriculum should be developed along with jury reference manual development.
4. Public service announcements are being drafted as part of a contest that ASU is promoting for their students.
5. Grand jury processes need to be refined in the future.
6. Interpreter-juror issues need to be addressed in the future.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve the report from the Committee to Study Jury Practices and Procedures as presented. Motion was passed unanimously. LJC 02-15.**

10. Proposed Changes to Rule 17.2

Ms. Eleanor Eisenberg, Executive Director of the ACLU in Arizona, was not available for this item. Ms. Eisenberg will be invited to participate in December.

11. Court Interpreter Committee

Mr. Ted Wilson presented a summary of the work the committee did over the summer. The committee will be presenting four recommendations to the AJC at the October 17 meeting.

1. Certification should become a reality for courts in Arizona.
2. Coupled with certification, training should be promoted so that more individuals are able to pass the tests that ensure quality interpreters.
3. Legislative changes will be needed.
4. The commission on court interpreters needs to be established.

There are two nationally recognized experts who provide testing for court interpreters. Mr. Wilson believes the program will cost about \$100,000. Some of the funding will come from the interpreters themselves from fees.

Mr. Wilson stated there are no real deadlines to make certification a requirement in the near future. Education and training need to be in place before certification and testing can occur.

Ms. Barrett stated that the committee focused on quantity and quality of interpreters.

12. Records Retention and Disposition Schedule

Mr. Frank Maiocco stated that the Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators Association decided to clean up the language in the Records Retention and Disposition schedule in addition to the development of a form that courts must use to provide a record of the destruction of files. This form replaces a similar one that was required by Supreme Court Rule 29.

Added to the list are:

1. Dismissed or diversion cases
2. No complaints filed (scratches)
3. All others
4. Search warrants

In addition changes were made to 1a, b, bi, d and a new i. They changed “and” to “or”.

Ms. Barrett suggested looking at separating the disposition from the records retention schedule.

Judge Traynor asked about Rule 38 diversion cases. Do they fall under the five year retention or “diversion cases” that are kept for one year? A suggestion to 1c was to delete “or diversion” which will take care of Judge Traynor’s issue.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve the form only.**
Motion was passed. LJC 02-16

13. Centralized Citation Processing Bureau

Ms. Janet Scheiderer and Ms. Pam Pucetas stated that the AOC is in process of contract negotiations with a consultant to do pre-planning as part of the requirements analysis. The consultant will be looking at processes, cost analysis, other data entry, and best practices. The requirements analysis will become the RFP.

The intent is for the consultant to be under contract and working by October 15th for two and a half months. A survey was sent out to start gathering information on citations and other matters. The deadline for return of the survey is October 11th.

The first phase of this project is being funded by the AOC and is expected to cost about \$60,000.

Judge Lester expressed concern about how this project will go to RFP to get the “soft” money. Ms. Scheiderer stated if “soft” money processing is centralized, it would free up time for court staff to do other court related tasks. Judge Kennedy is concerned that removing some processes from the court may end up with funding sources reducing staffing levels which would make the courts strapped for staff.

Judge Traynor is concerned that court would have to compare the outsourced data entry to current court records to see if the defendant is the same person number and verify it. Ms. Joan Harphant stated that AZTEC does not perform the comparison and verification function well. Judge Lester noted that comparison and verification of data is not being done now. The court would need to have a confidence level that the data is being entered carefully.

Ms. Scheiderer stated that the contracted entity would have performance measures to achieve. This potentially would be one of them. The consultant will develop specification for the RFP after gathering data.

Ms. Scheiderer stated that this project came about as the result of Mr. Don Stapley, a Maricopa County Supervisor, expressing his concerns about court costs in the future, especially with Maricopa County's growth. A number of factors led into the study for the Centralized Citation Bureau, including very high accounts receivable.

Judge Kennedy asked if both collectible and non-collectible debts were looked at? Ms. Scheiderer stated that the accounts receivable study was based on information the AOC had available electronically. Judge Kennedy thinks cases need to be reviewed based on demographics and ability to pay.

Ms. Scheiderer mentioned that AOC staff is looking at the federal tax intercept program. Judge Kennedy asked when AZTEC was going to better interface with DSO? Ms. Scheiderer stated that an effort is underway to have DSO pull information from AZTEC.

The RFP for the contractor is on the website on the Internet under Procurement. Ms. Pucetas was asked to send copies of the RFP to LJC members.

Judge Hale asked if anyone has spoken to the county treasurers yet about this program. Ms. Scheiderer explained what the process is. The monies will go back to the courts who disburse as usual.

Ms. Pam Jones asked if the CCB would be limited to AZTEC courts. Ms. Pucetas stated that she is looking into interfaces with other systems.

LJC members requested that the consultant update them at the December meeting.

14. Public Access to Electronic Court Records

Ms. Jennifer Greene addressed the committee on its earlier request relating to ARS §13-2813 and whether limited jurisdiction courts should be withholding information on criminal charges in the absence of proof of service on the defendant. Ms. Greene stated the Public Access to Electronic Court Records Committee determined this is a legal issue and not a public policy issue. Mr. Greg Eades as AOC staff attorney was assigned to research this issue.

Mr. Eades believes that courts who give out information regarding criminal charges before the defendant is served are in violation of this statute. His recommendation is to keep the information confidential until after the charge is served.

Ms. Greene stated that according to Ms. Kate Bibber, court staff have been trained to seal those cases in question in the system. Sealing a case requires an action on the part of the clerk who must key in a "Y" in the appropriate data field to seal the case in the AZTEC system. Judge Anagnost asked how do you unseal the record and when? What do you do when the defendant is appearing in court? Defense attorneys often wish to accept service of a summons for their clients. Does the court staff deny information about a person's outstanding charges to his or her attorney? Judge Kennedy said that his staff is trained to pull up all of a person's cases and have the defendant take care of all their cases when they appear. What happens if they come in and hear about a case on which they haven't yet been served?

Mr. Eades reiterated that the recommendation is to keep information confidential until after the charge is served. Judge Traynor stated that the court does not know if or when a defendant has been served because service is frequently by certified mail and the green card has not been returned not until after the arraignment. Mr. Eades will look at revising the ARS §13-2813 to update it. The word "complaint" was added in 1978.

Judge Anagnost stated that once a case is entered into the system, it becomes part of the public access site (public domain) which places the court in violation of the statute.

How do you answer a defendant who calls and asks if there are cases against him and he hasn't been served? If you say that he doesn't have a case, he won't appear and then the court issues a warrant. He then fights it because he called the court and was told there was nothing pending. Mr. Ted Jarvi also explained how a defendant calling the court to inquire about any outstanding warrants he or she may get erroneous information and subsequently be arrested.

These issues can be associated with long form complaints or traffic citations.

The members requested that this issue be brought back at the December meeting.

15. New Judge Orientation Update

Honorable John Kennedy stated that the New Judge Orientation committee met on Monday, September 23rd. They divided the subject material into smaller categories to help with the manner and logic of presentation. Their next meeting is October 7th.

16. Initial Appearance Master, Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, Proposed Rule 1.7 (New)

Mr. David Withey stated the new Rule 1.7 for the initial appearance master is requested for adoption on an emergency basis. This means, if adopted, the rule goes into effect immediately with a commentary period while the rule is in effect.

The purpose of the rule is to address a gap in services that occurred when implementing the Constitutional prohibition against non-law trained judges pro tempore. The rule is narrow in scope. It is designed to appoint a master (non-lawyer) to hear initial appearances and to not conflict with the Constitution. Adding arraignments to duties that could be conducted by the master. Legally, arraignments can wait. Another option is to give authority to the master for combined initial appearance and arraignment proceedings.

Concern was expressed if this should be expanded to include juveniles. This does not include advisory hearings in felony cases for juveniles. Those hearings are held in Superior Court.

Mr. Jarvi stated that it is a good idea to have these special masters. The defendant should have the right to challenge bonds set by masters.

A special master should not accept changes of plea. Concern was expressed regarding sentencing a defendant.

Judge Traynor addressed a separate issue regarding dually elected or appointed justices of the peace or magistrates handling weekend duty. Justices of the peace and magistrates in some jurisdictions take turns hearing initial appearances for individuals held in custody for their collective jurisdictions. The Rules of Criminal Procedure direct that a defendant be brought before the nearest or most accessible magistrate. The Rule appears to be complied with but some non lawyer justices of the peace or magistrates are being informed they cannot hear the initial appearance because they are not pro tems for the other jurisdictions.

Concern was expressed about section (e) Powers which gives the masters all the powers of a magistrate to perform only those duties authorized by section (a). The members thought it was confusing and unnecessary.

Judge Lester thinks the master should be limited to initial appearances.

Mr. Withey suggested that there be intergovernmental agreements between counties and cities to allow sitting judges to take turns hearing each other's cases. He agreed to review the matter further.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve the proposal as amended. Motion as amended was passed. LJC 02-19**

AMENDMENT: Amendment was made and seconded that **judges pro tempore be attorneys and the special masters to hear initial appearances be used as a temporary solution for a duration of one year. Amendment failed to pass. LJC 02-17**

AMENDMENT: Amendment was made and seconded to **approve Rule 1.7 except for Section E. Amendment was passed. LJC 02-18**

**17. Rules and Forms Subcommittee
Rule 7.2b**

Judge Anagnost asked that LJC pass a motion to authorize the filing of a Rule 28 petition to amend Rule 7.2b.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **authorize the filing of a Rule 28 petition to amend Rule 7.2b. Motion was passed. LJC 02-20**

Judge Anagnost reviewed the proposed changes to the Rules of Civil Traffic Appeals. There were no substantive changes made to them, only to conform to the proposed Superior Court Rules of Appeals Procedure - Criminal (SCRAP).

Judge Anagnost distributed a matrix that describes some of the changes to SCRAP Version 3.0.

1. Computation of time is more specific. No enlargement of time for mailing. The general rule is file the original plus one copy with the trial court. The trial court sends on the copy. The response time is from the date of receipt with more time than normal allowed.
2. Record on appeal was reworded. The proposed new rule talks about “hard documents” such as the complaint and judgment as being automatically part of the record. The idea of a “smart record” is still maintained.
3. Motion practice. The key point is to resolve cases without duplicating the record at both trial and superior court when the appeal is without merit. Motions for more time will be heard by a trial court judge, but a different one than the one who heard the issue appealed from. Substantive motions are also heard by a trial court judge, but a different one. The decision will be in writing. Motions to strike, inadequate appellant memos, etc. will be referred to superior court.
4. Bond on appeal was changed to clarify that posting of a bond cannot be a condition of the defendant’s right to appeal.

5. Forms will be clarified to “defendant’s right of appeal” to avoid confusion if the state is the appellant.

Mr. Don Taylor, City of Phoenix Prosecutor’s Office, stated that their biggest concerns are regarding the substantive motions. The question is if there is legal basis for the trial court to rule on any appeals motion.

The second issue is the question of appearance. The prosecutors prefer that substantive motions go to superior court. They understand that the superior court has administrative difficulties getting these heard timely.

Another concern was about the Rule 7.2b, bond on appeal issue. He understands that LJC is proposing amending that rule which make take care of the current issue.

The last concern is about time periods, whether they have control over court events.

Judge Anagnost said that the current rule says an appeal must be filed within 20 days. The time frame was expanded to get over motions asking for more time to file the appeal. The proposed rule took out the requirement for a quick transcript.

Mr. Chris McBride, City of Phoenix Public Defender’s Office, state that once the notice of appeal is filed, the trial court is out of the picture. The superior court was to hear all substantive appeals which they said they cannot do.

Can trial courts here substantive motions? It would have to be a different judge. Also can the posting of a bond be a condition of release?

Judge Sherry Geisler stated that she does not have another judge to hear those cases.

Judge Anagnost stated that a different judge would have to hear the motion.

Judge Kennedy commends Judge Anagnost for all his work.

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **move forward with the civil traffic and criminal rules of appeals proposals with changing the phrase “substantive motions” to “procedural motions”**. The motion was passed. LJC 02-21

18. Strategic Planning Subcommittee

Mr. Paul Thomas stated that he has no report.

OTHER BUSINESS

19. Approval of 2003 Meeting Dates

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **approve the 2003 meeting dates as presented. Motion was passed. LJC 02-22**

20. Call to the Public

Judge Traynor called to the public.

21. Adjournment

MOTION: Motion was made and seconded to **adjourn the meeting. Motion was passed. LJC 02-23.**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ms. Lori Johnson
Staff to the Limited Jurisdiction Courts Committee